

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 30, 2005 and is being filed with an RCE request.

The Office Action reports that claims 12-18, 20, 21, 53, 54, 57, 58 and 64 were rejected as being anticipated by Landolt et al. (US 4,257,201). Of these claims, claims 12 and 64 are independent. Applicant has amended claims 12 and 64 in a manner believed to patentably distinguish the present invention from this reference.

As amended, claim 12 recites a gantry support structure comprising an elongated damping structure comprising a plurality of overlapping elongated segments forming at least a portion of a housing. Overlapping segments proximate each other are joined together with a damping material disposed therebetween to define a corresponding fastening region. In addition, adjacent fastening regions are spaced apart from each other along a cross-section of the housing taken transversally with respect to elongation of the overlapping segments and where the fastening regions are disposed substantially along the length of the corresponding opposed overlapping elongated segments.

Landolt et al. do not teach or suggest this structure.

Landolt et al. are cited for disclosing overlapping segments 20, 19 and 34 that are joined with a damping material 112 disposed therebetween to define a corresponding fastening region. Fastening regions 108 are spaced-apart from each other along a cross-section of the housing taken transversally with respect to elongation of the overlapping segment. Reference is made to figure 3 of Landolt et al.

It is believed the amendments made to claim 12 clarify the patentable differences of the present invention. As recited, the fastening regions extend along the length of the overlapping segments. This feature is not taught or suggested by Landolt et

al. The elastic material 112 used by Landolt et al. appears in small slide assemblies 60, 61, 70, 71, 80, 81, 90 and 91 that allow beams 15, 19 and 20 to move relative to each other.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claim 12. Claims 53 and 54 have been amended to recite further features of the present invention. Dependent claims 13-21 and 53-63 depend directly or indirectly from claim 12 and are believed separately allowable.

Similar amendments have been made to independent claim 64 as those made in claim 12, and for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 12, claim 64 is also believed allowable. With this amendment, applicant has added dependent claims 65 - 67. When combined with the features recited in claim 64, and any intervening claim, each of these dependent claims is believed allowable.

The Office Action reports that claims 21, 55, 56 and 59-63 were allowable. Applicant respectfully acknowledges this indication of allowability; however, for the reasons discussed about it is believed that claim 12 is allowable as amended.

An extension of time is hereby requested for responding to this Office Action. A charge authorization for the extension of time fee is included herewith.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Steven M. Kochler, Reg. No. 36,188
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312